

Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project

Coordination with the National Park Service

ROLE: National Park Service has stated that it has oversight responsibility for the National Historic Landmarks (NHL), National Monuments (NM) and the National Register for Historic Places

Project is adjacent to the Pearl Harbor NHL and World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument

Project is in close proximity to Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet (CINCPAC) NHL, USS Bowfin NHL, USS Arizona NHL and USS Utah NHL

Project is on the makai edge of the Chinatown Historic District which is on the NRHP

COORDINATION TO DATE:

Meeting 17Dec08	Multi-party meeting on effects to historic resources. NPS and other agencies provided scoping-type input for the Historic Effects Report that was developed.
Letter 5Feb09	Identified effect to Pearl Harbor NHL. Identified concern with visual and noise impacts.
Meeting 4March09	Discussed access to and effects to WWII Valor in the Pacific NHM.
Meeting 9March09	Met with Oakland Office about effects to WWII Valor in the Pacific NHM.
Field Visit 17March09	Visit to WWII Valor in the Pacific NHM. Conducted noise measurements and photography per NPS request to assess project effects.
Meeting 18March09	Met with Pearl Harbor Historic Partners to discuss access from the Project to sites and effects related to parking and access.

Letter 21May09	Questions and comments on the Historic Effects Report. Identified adverse effect, but did not suggest measures to mitigate or minimize harm.
Telecon 5June09	Addressed issues and questions raised by NPS on the Historic Effects Report.
Response Letter to NPS 21June09	Responded to questions raised in May letter and 5June09 call. Provided revised project design that removed station touchdown locations from within the NHL boundary.
Telecon 30June09	Responded to outstanding questions. Provided backup noise information. Also clarified location of CINCPAC HQ building, which NPS had misidentified as a different building that is located between HQ building and the project alignment.
<p>NOTE: On 29June09 City received revised letter from SHPD on Determination of Effect. CITY and FTA accepted findings of letter to move project forward. Letter did not include explanation of determination that project would have an adverse effect on 11 additional resources, including PH NHL and the CINCPAQ HQ NHL.</p>	
Meeting 30July09	Consulting parties meeting regarding project PA and mitigation. Several NPS comments primarily related to HABS/HALS procedural issues.
Meeting 4August09	Follow-up consulting party PA meeting. PA version was distributed that addressed NPS concerns from July 30 meeting. Request for post-construction noise monitoring stipulation added to PA.
Letter 6August09	Letter reiterated adverse effect opinion for CINCPAC and PH NHL. Repeated noise monitoring stipulation request. Acknowledged project would have no noise impact under FTA criteria, but requested additional study to other criteria that are not used for transit project impact assessment.
Telcon 18August09	Call to Frank Hays to clarify 6August09 letter. Hays stated that because RTD concurred with adverse effect opinion rendered by SHPD, NPS

did not see need to explain rationale for their concurrence with adverse effect determination. Hays agreed to confer with Elaine Jackson-Retondo as to reason for adverse effect determination; previously NPS had expressed concern regarding noise, vibration and visual impacts of project. 6August09 letter did not discuss vibration or visual impacts of project.

ISSUES WITH NPS:

- NPS position regarding effects on resources within the Area of Potential Effect for the Project:
 1. Pearl Harbor NHL – NPS previously cited concerns regarding noise, vibration and visual impacts; however, after receipt of requested supplemental information, NPS only commented and provided mitigation stipulation on noise impacts
 2. CINCPAC NHL – City corrected NPS regarding location of CINCPAC NHL; location of CINCPAC building is further away from alignment than what NPS had originally assumed, therefore this should not be an issue
 3. Chinatown Historic District – Hays has cited visual impacts of project on makai edge of Chinatown; however, he has not suggested appropriate mitigation to be included in the PA; we need guidance as to what stipulations would be acceptable to mitigate an unmitigatable impact
 4. Other NRHP resources – Hays has stated that NPS has responsibility for NRHP resources, which we question, but has not cited any resources other than Chinatown that would be adversely impacted
- Review time

Project has requested expedited review of materials; but when new requested supplementary materials provided an entirely new review period commences as if it was a new issue

ACTIONS REQUESTED:

- Provide FTA/City with NPS determinations as to adverse effects of project, reasons why effects are adverse, and recommended mitigation measures proportional to impact